

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3 and 4 and canceled the non-elected claim 2 without prejudice. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments to the claims are supported by the application as originally filed and do not contain any new matter. Accordingly, the Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims as amended. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to claim 1 was previously argued in response to the prior Office Action and therefore does not raise new issue which would require further consideration and/or search. Still further, the amendment to claim 4 is merely to clarify the language in the manner suggested by the Examiner and it too does not require any further consideration and/or search. Accordingly, Applicant will discuss the Office Action in terms of the claims as amended.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 claim under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In view of the amendments to claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 now complies with 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Sakamaki in view of Sato et al.

Applicant has carefully reviewed Sakamaki and respectfully submits that while Sakamaki may disclose that which the Examiner states it does, Sakamaki does not disclose, show or suggest that one would provide a groove along the outer surface of each tooth of the teeth to divide the teeth in the widthwise direction of the teeth.

Applicant has carefully reviewed Sato et al. and respectfully submits that Sato et al. merely describes forming a groove by cutting out the top surface or crest of the tooth portion of the gear and there is no showing, suggestion or requirement that the groove be also formed on the front and rear facing surfaces of the tooth and/or in the valley between each of the tooth. Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion that one would combine the teachings of Sato et al. with Sakamaki.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that not only is the combination suggested by the Examiner not Applicant's invention but also the combination suggested by the Examiner is not suggested by the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1 and 3 are not obvious over Sakamaki in view of Sato et al.


Applicant respectfully and retroactively requests a one month extension of time to respond to the Final Office Action. Please charge Deposit Account No. 11-1445 in the sum of \$110.00 as the fee.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Rule 116 Amendment be entered, favorably considered and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this Amendment or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By: 
William L. Androlia
Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East
Suite 1430
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (310) 277-1391
Fax: (310) 277-4118

OFFICIAL

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (703) 872-9327 on September 11, 2003.


William L. Androlia

Name

9/11/2003

Signature

Date

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 12 2003